



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,969	01/26/2006	Christoph Klein	HM-636PCT	9492
40570	7590	09/26/2007	EXAMINER	
FRIEDRICH KUEFFNER 317 MADISON AVENUE, SUITE 910 NEW YORK, NY 10017			LANGDON, EVAN H	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3654		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		09/26/2007		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/538,969	KLEIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit Evan H. Langdon	3654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 18 September 2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Braun et al. (US 6,578,789) in view of Reba et al. (US 4,014,487).

Braun discloses a device for deflecting sections of a metal strip 8, in a coiling plant, from a beginning guide channel 5 into an end guide channel 9 comprising a driver with a pair of driver rollers 1,2 and control elements arranged downstream in strip conveyance direction, further comprising a switch 10 that can be swiveled towards the beginning guide channel 5 or the end guide channel 9, and a guide table (Fig. 1) which is swivelably supported under the switch and positionable as a wiper 11 against the lower driver roller 2, wherein the switch is shaped on its top and bottom sides and is flexibly arranged at the outlet end of an assigned strip transport

Art Unit: 3654

roller-conveyor (7, 7'), such that it clears the beginning guide channel when in a raised position, and in that the guide table is shaped corresponding to the bottom side of the switch 10, and in that an actuating mechanism as a hydraulic unit is assigned to both the switch and the guide table, wherein an acute angle end of the switch 10 points against the conveyance direction.

Reba teaches a switch 152 that is convexly shaped on its top and bottom sides.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the switch and the guide table of Braun to include a switch that is convexly shaped on its top and bottom sides and to make the corresponding surface of the guide table concave as suggested by, to more easily direct that moving web. Braun discloses a switch which is flatly shaped on its top and bottom sides and the corresponding surface of the guide table as flat. It would be obvious to modify the guide table when modifying the switch to correspond the shape.

In regards to claim 2, Braun as modified by Reba teaches the switch functions as a wiper and rests against the upper driver roller 1.

In regards to claim 3, Braun as modified by Reba teaches convex sides meet in a point (Figures 7 and 8, Reba).

In regards to claim 5, Braun as modified by Reba teaches the guide surfaces of the switch 10 equipped with a glide roller 15 (Fig. 6, Braun). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the guide table to be equipped with a guide roller as well to facilitate a smooth transition of the web.

Response to Arguments

The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test for obviousness is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). Moreover, in evaluating such references it is proper to take into account not only the specific teachings of the references but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom (see *In re Preda*, 401 F.2d 825, 159 USPQ 342 (CCPA 1968)) and skill, rather than the converse is presumed on the part of those of ordinary skill in the art (see *In re Sovish*, 769 F.2d 738, 226 USPQ 771 (Fed. Cir. 1985)). Reba is relied on to teach a web directing device that is convexly shaped on its top and bottom sides to more easily direct that moving web, the Examiner does not suggest replacing the switch of Braun with switch of Reba, rather modifying the switch of Braun with the convex feature of Reba.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Evan H. Langdon whose telephone number is (571)272-6948. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

Art Unit: 3654

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Cuomo can be reached on (571) 272-6856. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Evan Langdon
Patent Examiner
AU 3654